

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 27, 2005 has been received and carefully studied.

The Examiner objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). The Examiner requires that a snow plow blade, a chain saw, and a jack hammer must be shown.

By the accompanying amendment, these elements have been added to Figures 9 by a labeled rectangular box, as these elements are not essential to a proper understanding of the invention. The specification has been amended to refer to the box as element 99. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner also objects to the drawings because reference numerals 32, 55 and 35 are not clearly shown in Figure 1. Submitted herewith is an amended Figure 1 with the reference numerals clearly shown.

The Examiner objects to the disclosure because the acronym ATV is not written out as all-terrain vehicle. By the accompanying amendment, this change has been made.

The Examiner objects to claim 1 due to an informality which has been corrected by the accompanying amendment.

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,577,712 in view of Pralle, U.S. Patent No. 4,864,878. The Examiner states that Foote et al. disclose an off-road

vehicle having a torque converter 78, including a shaft 70, a shaft extension, and a hydraulic system driven by the shaft and in communication with hydraulic fluid. The Examiner admits that Foote et al. do not disclose a drive pulley on the shaft with an endless belt or a driven pulley on the hydraulic pump, but cites Pralle as teaching these features. The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to provide an endless belt, a drive and driven pulleys in the system of Foote in view of the teachings of Pralle because Pralle teaches that the belt drive system can be used when a chain is used to drive a hydraulic pump.

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Foote et al. disclose an off-road recreational vehicle that can be converted to a work vehicle using a hydraulic pressure generating mechanism. A manual hydraulic pump clutch is interposed between the engine shaft and the hydraulic pump to selectively engage and disengage the pump from the engine.

Nowhere do Foote et al. disclose or suggest a torque converter as recited in the instant claims. The Examiner refers to element 78 of Foote et al. as a torque converter, however, element 78 is defined by Foote et al. as the transmission. Applicant respectfully submits that a torque converter is a term of art, and is not present in the

vehicle of Foote et al. Indeed, Foote et al. uses a clutch between the engine and the transmission.

Pralle does not supply the aforementioned deficiency of Foote et al.

The Examiner also rejects claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote et al. in view of Pralle and further in view of Shultz et al.; claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote et al. in view of Pralle and further in view of Duttarer; claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote et al. in view of Pralle and further in view of Jordan; and claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote et al. in view of Pralle and further in view of Christensen.

Claims 4-8 are believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence, for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1-3. The secondary references do not supply the above-recited deficiencies of Foote et al.

Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing.

Respectfully submitted,


Kevin S. Lemack
Reg. No. 32,579
176 E. Main Street - Suite 7
Westboro, Massachusetts 01581
TEL: (508) 898-1818